

Application No. 09/849,700  
Applicant: Daniel R. Romesburg

Page 7 of 8  
Amendment of 3/12/04

#### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of December 17, 2003.

The Examiner's objections to Claims 1 and 3 are noted. It is deemed that the amendments to Claims 1 and 3 herein overcome all grounds of objection to these claims.

The Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roessler (US 4,649,572)" and the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 "as being unpatentable over Frye (US 6,334,220) in view of Blackshear (US 5,956,763)" is noted. These rejections are traversed.

More specifically, the now amended generic Claim 2 is a combination of the vehicle safety belt and the bib portion, receptacle portion, and attaching components wherein the attaching components act to couple the bib portion to the vehicle seat belt in an arrangement not disclosed or suggested in the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner or known to applicant. This arrangement allows for attachment to the belt wherein apparel worn by a user will be in no way damaged or marred, or have to be modified, to accomplish the purposes of the bib when eating in a car.

It would appear that the Examiner has merely gleaned miscellaneous features in the prior art and has attempted to combine them without a teaching for their combination. The only

Application No. 09/849,700

Page 8 of 8

Applicant: Daniel R. Romesburg

Amendment of 3/12/04

teaching is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art. But even if there were a teaching for the combination, the resulting structure would still fail to anticipate applicant's invention for the reasons set forth herein above.

It is deemed that the amendments herein overcome all grounds of objection and rejection. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are requested.